DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 007 AL 002 550

AUTHOR Cohen, Andrew D.
TITLE A Sociolinguistic Approach to Bilingual Education. The Measurement of Language Use and Attitudes Toward Language in School and Community, with Special Reference to the Mexican American Community of Redwood City, California.
PUB DATE Sep 70
NOTE 66p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.40
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education, Bilingualism, Bilingual Students, Child Language, *Community Attitudes, Demography, *Elementary Grades, Interference (Language Learning), Language Proficiency, Language Research, Language Usage, *Mexican Americans, Questionnaires, School Attitudes, *Sociolinguistics

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to place bilingual schooling in a sociolinguistic context by relating language use in school to language use in the community. The city treated here, Redwood City, California, has a growing Mexican American population and was one of the 23 California cities selected for bilingual schooling through Title VII; programs were initiated during the 1969-1970 school year. Chapter I, "The Sociolinguistic Description of a Bilingual Community" traces the history of the Mexican American community in Redwood City, and discusses models for dealing with bilingual communities and their applicability to the Redwood City situation. Chapter II, "The Measurement of Oral Language Proficiency of Bilinguals" reviews the literature on discrete-point and overall skills of oral proficiency for young bilinguals and presents general information on the nature of Spanish-English bilingualism among the Redwood City kindergartners and first-graders who were the subjects of the study. Concluding remarks stress the importance of considering socioeconomic and other home factors in studying the child's verbal abilities and the need for better discrete -point and overall skill tests. An appendix presents the questionnaires used in the study, and an 118 entry bibliography completes the work. (Author/FWB)

EDO 43007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A SOCIOLINGUISTIC APPROACH TO BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The measurement of language use and attitudes toward language in school and community, with special reference to the Mexican American community of Redwood City, California

AL 002 550

Andrew D. Cohen
Committee on Linguistics
Stanford University
Stanford, California

September, 1970

Preface

With the advent of bilingual schooling for Mexican American children, it is important to integrate a variety of research efforts that may appear widely divergent in focus, but which are all relevant to the concerns of bilingual education. This paper is an attempt to place bilingual schooling in a sociolinguistic context by relating language use in school to language use in the community. Directions for research are suggested, drawing on numerous research efforts in the literature. Preliminary statements are made about one bilingual community which has embarked on a program of bilingual schooling.

I am most thankful to Dr. Charles A. Ferguson, Dr. Robert L. Cooper, Dr. G. Richard Tucker, and Dr. A. Richard Diebold, Jr., for their comments and suggestions in the preparation of this paper.

Table of Contents

		Page
	Introduction	1
I.	The Sociolinguistic Description of a Bilingual Community. . . .	6
II.	The Measurement of Oral Language Proficiency of Bilinguals .	20
III.	Summary and Conclusion	34
	Appendix.	38
	Footnotes	50
	Bibliography.	53

Introduction

Redwood City is a city of approximately 54,200 people, located thirty miles south of San Francisco. In 1964, Spanish-surnamed children comprised 5.1% of Redwood City's school enrollment in grades K-8. In 1969, Spanish surnamed children comprised 11.2% of the enrollment (Moreno, 1969):

Year	Total Enrollment	Spanish Surnames
1964	10,407	532
1969	10,545	1,182

Since many of the new Spanish-surnamed students are recent immigrants from Mexico, they are also Spanish speaking. It is important to point this out because, as Valdez (1969) asserts, a Spanish surname does not necessarily indicate that a person is Spanish-speaking nor of Mexican origin.

This rapid increase in Spanish speakers in the Redwood City School District dramatized the need to provide instruction through Spanish language and classes in English as a second language for native Spanish speakers. Under the auspices of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Bilingual Education Program, Title VII, the Redwood City School District began an experiment in bilingual education in the fall of 1969. The Redwood City project was initiated with one pilot first-grade class of twenty low-

income native Spanish speakers and ten middle-income native English speakers at the Garfield School. The bilingual model chosen for the project was that of long-term bilingual/bicultural education[1] for both Mexican Americans and Anglos[2] (see Mackey, 1970; Fishman, 1970; Valencia, 1969; Gaarder, 1967, on different models for bilingual programs). Spanish language arts and social studies are taught in Spanish both to native Spanish speakers and to native English speakers, while the Spanish speakers also receive math and science instruction in Spanish.

The Redwood City project was one of twenty-three Spanish-English bilingual education projects in California for 1969-70, and will be one of forty-one during the 1970-71 academic year. Thus, whereas Mexican Americans were punished, even suspended or expelled, for using Spanish in the schools in this country's educational past (Bernal, 1969; Carter, 1970, pp. 97-98), they are now being encouraged to do so. At the same time, many educators are coming to accentuate the value of cultural diversity in America. In effect, the melting pot theory is being refined to allow for cultural pluralism within the mainstream culture.

Much needs to be learned about the effectiveness of bilingual schooling for bilingual children, especially those coming from lower-class homes. It appears that some come to school with the verbal skills required to compete in the white middle-class school, while some come ill-equipped to handle school language. Lower-status Mexican American children are not, as a group, verbally deficient or "alingual," as one prevailing stereotype

would suggest (see Carter, 1970; Labov, 1970a). Many of these children excel in school-related verbal tasks. For example, the ability to recognize requests for verbal displays and to respond has been shown to exist among the so-called verbally deficient (Labov, 1969). More needs to be known about how these bilingual children acquire their two languages and what equips a child to perform well on school-related verbal tasks.

Studies done solely with monolingual English-speaking families suggest that language development in the child may depend in part or substantially on conditions in the home. Nisbet (1961) did a study in which he found that family size correlated significantly with verbal ability as measured by written tests of English attainment -- the larger the family, the less likely the child is to develop verbal skills. An earlier study by Milner (1951) found that performance by first-grade children on tests of reading correlated significantly with the extent to which parents read to their children and conversed with them. Wood (1946) found, among other things, that certain family factors may contribute to poor articulation in five-to-fourteen-year-old monolingual English speakers. Case history data suggested that lack of recreational outlet for parents, overly-severe child discipline methods, defective home membership (both parents working, father-absent home, divorced), economic instability, low education of parents, and transiency of location may all contribute to a child's poor articulation.

It would be helpful to find out if any or all of the above-mentioned family conditions exist in the homes of those Mexican American children who

experience difficulties in language development. Perhaps the above factors will be found to be largely irrelevant. Factors not discussed above, such as relationship with siblings and with peers, may provide certain insights. Whatever the case, more ought to be learned about the sources of language difficulty, if any, for the bilingual child in school.

School instruction and testing in native language, i.e., Spanish, may provide better skill development on the part of these Mexican American children. However, it may be that the language of instruction is not nearly so crucial for these children as other factors such as sufficient individual attention from teaching personnel and reinforcement of their self-concept and other socio-emotional needs (see Firme, 1969). It is also important to learn about parental and student attitudes toward the two languages in question and toward the bilingual program.

There is evidence that low-SES Mexican American children may not test well, even if tested in their first language by a Mexican American.[3,4] These children often are lacking practice in taking tests, and perhaps do not see the need to perform well on tests in the first place. They may not see the nee[illegible] do well in the white middle-class school altogether (Wilson, 1968). Research suggests that children from a depressed home socio-economically, where English is learned as a second language and where there is low self-confidence (as may be the case for the Brown man in a white society), will often attain low achievement in school. A study by Anderson and Johnson (1968) of high school juniors and seniors found that although motivation was

high among the Mexican Americans interviewed, their low socio-economic status, English language difficulties and low self-confidence resulted in low achievement.[5] A later study of sixth-grade Mexican-American students (Cordova, 1969) suggests that Mexican American students were alienated from the school system not because of poor achievement but because the curriculum was so mono-cultural. The recommendation made by that study was for bilingual/bicultural education in the schools.

Now that bilingual/ bicultural programs do exist, it is imperative to see how effective they are at meeting the educational and socio-cultural needs of the Mexican-American children. Regardless of whether bilingual education has been legislated as a political expedient to appease angry minority spokesmen[6] or as a genuine effort to preserve Spanish language and Mexican culture through formal instruction in the schools, bilingual programs are a reality. They provide a host of opportunities for researching bilingual schooling in America and its effect on the community.

Chapter I

The Sociolinguistic Description of a Bilingual Community

Christian and Christian (1966), in Fishman's Language Loyalty in the United States, state that the Spanish-speaking population is perhaps the fastest growing population in the Southwest. They note that the Spanish-speaking population in California increased by 88% between 1950 and 1960. Factors such as the proximity of Mexico to the United States and the availability of low-status jobs have encouraged immigration. The recent immigrants have come seeking greater prosperity, as most of them were among the very poor in Mexico.

The Mexican American population in Redwood City dates back to the early 1930's. Apparently escapees from copper mines in Mexico settled in the area at that time.[7] Mexicans then came during World War II. Many of them found only part-time employment, at the local cannery or elsewhere. Others were fortunate enough to find year-round work at cement factories, asbestos factories, steel factories, and the like. Within the last ten years there has been a new wave of immigration from the Mexican states of Michoacan, Jalisco, and Zacatecas. Many of these people have no ties with the earlier settlers. Although a good portion of them come from ranchos or rural areas, few were farmers. The jobs that the immigrant men find in Redwood City range from janitor or garbage collector to mechanic, truck driver, construction worker,

cook or tailor. If they work, the women work as maids, laundresses, and janitors, as well.

Some thirty years ago the Mexican immigrants in California were subject to exploitation and abuse (Bustamante & Bustamante, 1969). Now they find somewhat more favorable circumstances under which to live and work. For example, a UCLA report suggests decreasing discrimination against Mexican Americans in the labor market (Fogel, 1965). At the same time, Mexican Americans are more vocally asserting pride in la raza -- in their Mexican heritage and in the Spanish language, and the majority culture is coming to accept cultural differences as enriching and worthwhile for the society. Given these increasingly favorable conditions, it might be that the 1970 census will show an even greater increase in Spanish speakers from 1960 to 1970 than there was from 1950 to 1960.

This rapid influx of native Spanish speakers into a predominantly English-speaking society leads sociolinguists to pose certain questions. What effect, for instance, do these Spanish-speaking immigrants have on the existence and maintenance of the Spanish language among Mexican Americans in California? How rapidly and completely is Spanish being displaced by the socially and culturally dominant language, English? What dialects of Spanish are brought into California, and how are these preserved or replaced by American dialects of Spanish?

European colonies in the United States are fast losing native speakers of their respective languages and familiarity with their "old world" cultures

for lack of renewed contact with the home country or with recent immigrants (Fishman, 1966b). Mexican Americans, on the other hand, return frequently to Mexico, renewing cultural and linguistic ties, and the recent immigrants fraternize with the established immigrants and native-born. Factors such as these lead to speculation that the Spanish language may be used in California for many years to come (Christian and Christian, 1966). It is the task of the sociolinguist to determine the circumstances under which Spanish is used instead of English and the frequency with which it is used.

Sociolinguistic investigation of bilingual communities is actually a relatively new undertaking. Fishman (1964, 1965) has developed a theory for relating language choice behavior to domains of social interaction. Domains are defined as the larger institutional role-contexts within which habitual language use occurs, such as in the family, the community, the school, and occupational spheres of activity. Language usage is specified in terms of media (spoken or written language), speech role (production, comprehension, or inner speech), and speech situation (formal, semi-formal, informal, intimate). The interaction of language usage and domains forms a matrix called a bilingual dominance configuration. This bilingual dominance theory was generated to help measure bilingual usage within a community and to indicate the degree of maintenance and displacement of one language by another. Fishman has tested this theory empirically in a massive study in a Puerto Rican barrio outside of New York City (Fishman, 1968).

Until the Fishman study, little work had been done describing the

interrelationship between bilingualism and the socio-cultural context. Only a few descriptive studies of bilingual communities had existed (Barker, 1947; Weinreich, 1951; Haugen, 1953; Diebold, 1961; Rubin, 1968a). Yet the findings on the relative maintenance or shift of bilingual patterns in a community over time can have significant socio-cultural as well as pedagogical implications. With respect to the overall community, bilingual dominance studies can help to detect cultural changes (Rubin, 1968c). With respect to schooling within the community, such studies may call attention to trends in language usage reflecting the need for bilingual education[8] (Rubin, 1968b).

Thirty years before Fishman formalized his theory, Hoffman had devised an instrument for measuring the extent of bilingual background or environment to which an individual is exposed (Hoffman, 1934). Recent studies have still used the Hoffman Bilingual Scale (see Jones, 1960; Lewis & Lewis, 1965; Riley, 1968) to assess degree of bilingualism. However, as Haugen points out (Haugen, 1956, pp. 94-95), this is a rather imperfect instrument when trying to measure the subtleties of bilingualism. Hoffman makes no attempt to assess where and when one language would be chosen instead of the other. Bilingualism is viewed as present or not present, with no attempt to differentiate the conditions under which a person speaks one language, the other language, or both.

Fishman saw bilingualism to be more complex in nature, and in accordance devised his theory of the interaction of language usage and social domain. In his immense study Bilingualism in the Barrio, Fishman (1968) selects as the

most pivotal domains of language use those of family, neighborhood, religion, education, and work. Through isolating domains within which a bilingual person could function in one or both languages, Fishman tries to obtain a more accurate picture of bilingualism than that given by the Hoffman Scale. Fishman admits, however, that domains should be specified empirically rather than on the basis of a priori social guesses (Fishman, 1969).

Regardless of whether the chosen domains are social and linguistic realities to the bilingual speakers, there is still the problem of specifying the following factors (or at least determining whether they are important in a given interaction): (1) the particular setting (time, place, & situation) within the domain, (2) the participants (in terms of sex, age, occupation, and whether intimates, friends, acquaintances or unknowns), (3) the topic, (4) the speaker's appraisal of the other speaker's ability in the two languages, (5) the formality of the situation, (6) the form and tone of speech, (7) the roles of the participants (e.g. boss and employee), (8) the functions of the interaction, (9) the language preference of the speaker, and last, but not least, (10) the relative status or prestige level of the two languages in the community. Hymes (1962, 1967) and Ervin-Tripp (1964) list these and still other factors determining a bilingual's choice of language (also dialect and style) in any speech act.[9]

Given the long list of variables which may determine speech behavior, it is not surprising that little effort has been made to account for all of these factors at once. Ervin-Tripp remarks:

> In using naturalistic situations, we can discern the critical factors in determination of alternations only if we can find in nature comparisons in which other possible relevant factors are held constant (Ervin-Tripp, 1964, pp. 93-94).

Rubin did one of the only studies attempting to isolate key dimensions in a bilingual's choice of languages. For bilinguals in a rural town and in a rural "area" in Paraguay, she found that 'location', 'formality', 'intimacy', and 'seriousness' were key dimensions which helped to explain the choice of Guarani or Spanish (Rubin, 1968a, 1968c). One of the great contributions Fishman has made to this kind of study is to apply new statistical rigor. Instead of simply running cross-tabulations of one variable with another, Fishman (1968) introduces factor analysis and analysis of variance via multiple regression to allow for the multiple prediction of criterion or dependent variables by a host of other variables.

The interaction models of Fishman and Hymes, however, usually assume that the participants are balanced bilinguals. A balanced bilingual is a person with relatively equal facility in both languages. It is difficult enough to explain the choice of language a person makes when he has no real limitations on speaking either. It is much harder to explain language choice when the bilingual is greatly deficient in one of his two languages (see Diebold, 1961) or when he lacks the language skills for a particular media, role, situation, and domain. Perhaps the key variables determining choice of language both for balanced and imbalanced bilinguals may be attitudinal. For instance, a child's use of language X over language Y may depend largely on parental attitudes

toward the two languages and on the child's own language preference. Such variables would cut across media, role, situation, and domain.

The work of Lambert and others on attitudes toward speakers of different languages and dialects (Lambert, Frankel, Tucker, 1966; Tucker & Lambert, 1966; Lambert, 1967) suggests that speech groups have definite attitudes towards speakers of their own language or dialect and speakers of other languages and dialects. These attitudes may explain why individuals choose to speak either their own or another group's language or dialect. The most successful research technique used by Lambert et al. (see Lambert, 1967) is referred to as the matched-guise technique, and attempts to reveal more private attitudes toward speech groups than do direct attitude questionnaires.

The procedure involves the reactions of listeners to recordings of perfectly bilingual speakers reading a passage in one language and then the same passage in the other language. Groups of listeners are asked to evaluate the personality characteristics of each speaker, using voice cues only, and are kept unaware that they are actually hearing two readings by each of several bilinguals. Results show that certain groups of listeners will rate the bilinguals as, for instance, better looking, taller, more intelligent, and kinder in their English guise than in their French guise.

It may be valuable to study the interaction between parents' and children's attitudes toward the two languages in a bilingual community, and how these attitudes relate to the general prestige of the two languages in the society.

One study by Lambert and others (1962) of bilingual Franco-American high school students in Maine and Louisiana showed that where the prestige of the French community was greater and more stable, namely in Maine, the students' attitudes toward French and their achievement in French were better. In another study (Gardner, 1960, mentioned in Lambert, 1969), students with an integrative (culturally-favorable) disposition to learn French had parents who also were integrative and sympathetic to the French community, irrespective of parents' skills in French or the number of their French acquaintances. This study was replicated in the Philippines (Gardner & Santos, 1970), and results showed that whatever the motivation of the student for learning a second language, if the parents had that attitude themselves, the students were more successful in acquiring the second language. An ongoing study in Montreal is considering the language orientation (integrative vs. instrumental) and ethnic stereotypes held by English and French Canadian primary school children and their parents (Lambert, Tucker, d'Anglejan & Segalowitz, 1970).

Although the above studies often show that children adopt parents' attitudes, it may be erroneous to <u>assume</u> that children's attitudes reflect those of their parents. It may be that the child's behavior is motivated by a conscious or unconscious rejection of the parents' attitudes toward the languages.[10,11] For this reason, a thorough investigation of attitudes should be undertaken before assumptions are made as to the feelings people have toward the languages in a bilingual community.

In bilingual communities comprised primarily of immigrants, it appears important to determine years of residence in the United States, languages spoken by family members and relative proficiency in each, and socio-economic class. Anisfeld and Lambert (1962) showed that recentness of immigration and socio-economic class affected the orientation toward and achievement in Hebrew on the part of Jewish high school students in Montreal. Fishman (1966) and Lambert (1967) have pointed out that when a person moves into a different speech community with its different socio-cultural makeup, he may experience anomie, a feeling of social uncertainty or dissatisfaction. However, he may not. In a study by Derbyshire (1969) contrasting the attitudes of migrant and non-migrant lower-SES Mexican-American adolescents, it was found that the second and third generation residents of East Los Angeles were experiencing greater alienation and feeling of anomie than were the recent migrants. Apparently the migrants still felt strong cultural ties to Mexico.

The bilingual dominance model of Fishman and the attitudinal techniques of Lambert have yet to be employed in studying Mexican American bilingual communities. It appears that both approaches would be valuable in studying the bilingual community of Redwood City. The little work that has been done in describing Mexican American bilingual communities has either specialized on the linguistic or on the sociological aspects of the groups studied, but has not integrated the two. Most work done in dialectology gives little mention to the use of the dialect or dialects in the community (see

Espinosa, 1909, 1913, 1915; Post, 1933, 1943; Kercheville, 1934; Hills, 1937; Sawyer, 1957). The sociolinguistic work that has been done is limited to general statements about the number of languages and dialects and the general language/dialect preference of the speakers.

Barker (1947), for example, classified bilinguals of Tucson, Arizona, according to four types: the Old Families, the Colonia Mexicana, the Pochies, and the Pachucos. The Old Families spoke standard Spanish. The Colonia Mexicana, including many immigrants, spoke standard Mexican Spanish and non-standard English, favored Spanish in conversations with Anglos and tended to be shy about their English. The Pochies, usually American-born, spoke a Southern Arizona dialect of Spanish and non-standard English, favored English and avoided Spanish in conversations with Anglos. The Pachuco Group, mostly children of the Colonia Mexicana or of Pochies, spoke a Southern Arizona dialect of Spanish, Pachuco (see Barker, 1950),[12] and non-standard English, and favored the special language, Pachuco.

Thus, there are roughly two groups of bilinguals, rather than the four in the Barker study, but there may be greater dialectal diversity within each group. Some of the immigrants do not speak standard Spanish, but rather speak a ranchero dialect. In a home visit the author paid to one family, he learned that the neighbors' speech typed them as rancheros because they used archaic forms such as nadien (for nadie) and asina (for así). The family also suggested that there was a difference in status between the two dialects. They said that they did not like their children playing with the neighbors' children

because their children picked up incorrect forms from the neighbors' children.

It is difficult to generalize about the Spanish spoken by the equivalent of the Pochies, or the children of the Colonia Mexicana group. Length of residence in the United States and in California is a major determinant of the Spanish spoken. The anglicisms and regional Mexican American dialectal forms used by an American-born Spanish speaker are not so readily found in the speech of these recent immigrants. The non-standard English spoken by this group reflects that of the white and Black families whose homes are interspersed with theirs in the same low-rent district of Redwood City. Thus, their non-standard English speech may have elements of both Black and white non-standard dialect.

There are a handful of Texan and New Mexican Spanish speakers who have migrated to Redwood City. Most of these people are natives of the Southwest. Like the members of Tucson's Old Families, they speak standard English and their regional dialect of Spanish (that of Texas and New Mexico). But unlike the Old Families, they generally do not speak standard Spanish.

Clearly, this description of the Redwood City Spanish-speaking bilingual community is just a preliminary one. Research needs to be carried out in greater depth and breadth to determine the bilingual dominance configuration and the attitudinal environment in this community. The first step in carrying out such research is to design instruments that are appropriate for administration to the Redwood City community. Thus, instruments from the Bilingualism in the Barrio study, Lambert's bilingual education study in

Montreal, and elsewhere have to be adapted for this Mexican American context. Since the population includes illiterate adults, questionnaires meant for written reply have to be revised for oral interview.

The Appendix includes a set of instruments intended for use in Redwood City. Questionnaire #1, "Home Interview for Parents of Redwood City School Children," deals with various features of the home environments and socioeconomic backgrounds of the children in the bilingual program and in the control group. This questionnaire is intended both for Mexican American and Anglo parents. Questions concerning demographic variables, language proficiency and use, and educational environment are included. The questions on educational environment are based on a questionnaire used by Lambert et al. in the on-going study of bilingual education in Montreal (see Lambert & Macnamara, 1969), and is adapted from Bloom (1964). Information obtained from this questionnaire will help determine how the experimental and control groups should be set up, and will be used in providing covariates, as needed, to statistically equate groups that are not socioeconomically or educationally matched. For example, Anglo and Mexican American performance in the bilingual experimental group may not be comparable because of different socioeconomic and educational environments. Comparability may be obtained statistically by analysis of covariance (see Lambert & Macnamara, 1969).

In the same questionnaire, the parents are reporting their children's use of Spanish and English by domain (home, school, neighborhood, church). The parents are also reporting their own language use and proficiency. These

questions were taken from Fishman's language census employed in his study of a Puerto Rican neighborhood in Jersey City (Fishman, 1968). Questionnaire #1 will be used in a census of the households of the children in the bilingual project. These results will be compared with those from a sample survey of the target community to determine whether the households of children in the bilingual project are typical of the larger community with respect to language use and proficiency.

Questionnaire #2, "Pupil's Language Use and Proficiency Inventory," includes the pupil's self-report of his Spanish and English use by domain and a measure of language proficiency through the naming of objects commonly found in settings associated with those domains. These two instruments were used in a cross-sectional study of Puerto Rican school children's bilingualism in Bilingualism in the Barrio (Edelman, 1968). What remains to be seen is whether a bilingual pupil's language use and proficiency by domain are altered through his participation in a bilingual program.

Questionnaire #3 deals with Mexican American parents' views of the value of having their children learn their own group's language and that of the Anglos. Questionnaire #4 measures the orientation of Anglo parents toward their child's learning of Spanish. Similar questionnaires have been used in Montreal and elsewhere, and the concern is to measure the "instrumentality" or the "integrativeness" of parental orientations. Instrumental orientations emphasize the practical or economic advantages of learning a second language whereas integrative outlooks stress the interpersonal advantages and personal

gratifications that might follow from skill with a second language (see Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Lambert, Gardner, Olton, Tunstall, 1962).

Questionnaire #5 focuses on attitudes that Mexican American and Anglo parents and children have toward their own and the other group (see Lambert, Tucker, d'Anglejan, Segalowitz, 1970, pp. 74-84). Using sets of polar adjectives, parents and children will rate photographs of unknown members of one group or the other, and will also rate speakers in matched guises (described earlier in this paper). About half of the adjectives were taken from a list of stereotypic impressions that Parsons (1965) found Anglos and Mexican Americans have of each other. Many of the adjectives have been simplified, and some eliminated, for the pupils' rating sheet.

These instruments will need to be refined on the basis of local experience. But it is hoped that such questionnaires will help determine the bilingual dominance configuration and the attitudinal environment in the Redwood City bilingual community.

Chapter II

The Measurement of Oral Language Proficiency of Bilinguals

Psychologists have referred to bilinguals as either coordinate, those who think in two languages, or compound, those who think only in one language, usually the mother tongue (Ervin & Osgood, 1954). The coordinate bilingual is said to keep his two languages separate. He thinks in language X when producing messages to himself or to others in language X, and thinks in language Y when producing messages in language Y. When the compound bilingual speaks or writes his second language, it is said to be apparent that he is not thinking in that language from the degree of grammatical, lexical, and phonetic interference (Weinreich, 1968). Interference is a phenomenon said to occur when two languages come into contact (i.e., are used alternately by the same persons). Bilinguals are said to produce speech forms in each language that deviate from the norms of that language (Weinreich, 1968).

Fishman warns of labeling bilingual individuals as coordinate or compound, since many bilinguals show signs of both compound and coordinate behavior, depending on the topic, the speakers, and other factors[13] (Fishman, 1966b). Kolers (1968) has studied the thought processes of bilinguals, and has found that a bilingual thinks about some concepts only in the language in which the concepts were explained to him or encountered. Other concepts he thinks about and talks about freely in both languages, regardless of the language in

which he first encountered them.

Another way of describing bilinguals is in terms of language dominance, the more sociolinguistic approach mentioned earlier. Rather than suggesting whether thinking goes on in one language or both, language dominance refers to the proficiency of the individual in speaking and listening, and reading and writing (if applicable) the two languages. An individual may be rated as having one dominant language and one subordinate, or as having balanced skills in both languages (Lambert, 1955). An individual could also have one language as the dominant language for one skill, such as speaking, and the other language as the dominant language for another skill, such as writing (see Lieberson, 1966). Language dominance in, say, speaking may also be further specified according to domain, in keeping with Fishman's bilingual dominance configuration (Fishman, 1964). Cooper (1968) measured bilingual vocabulary knowledge for the domains of family, neighborhood, religion, education, and work.

There are two other related measures of language dominance[14] which have not been investigated extensively in the literature, but which may be of great value in understanding bilingual behavior. The first is the extent to which bilinguals mix their two languages and the degree to which one language is used more during such mixing.[15] Individuals mix their two languages by inserting either words or phrases of one language into their speech in the other language[16] (see Espinosa, 1917; Lance, 1969).

The second measure of dominance is the borrowing of words from one

language to use in the other. When words are borrowed intact from another language, without phonological change, the phenomenon is called either 'mixing', as above, or loanshift (Haugen, 1950). If the borrowed words are modified to conform to the phonological rules of the language, they are called loanwords (Haugen, 1950). Borrowing is of interest sociolinguistically because it gives clues as to the relative social value attached to speaking the two languages in a speech community. There are many reasons why words are borrowed, such as lack of a term or a precise term in the language being spoken, the need for synonyms, and the low frequency of the term in the language being spoken (Weinreich, 1968, p. 60). But perhaps the most significant reason for why people borrow forms from another language is that the other language has higher prestige in the community. (for an explication of 'prestige language', see Cohen, 1969). Sawyer (1959) reports that at the time when the Spanish-speaking population of San Antonio, Texas, enjoyed equal status with Anglo settlers, many Spanish words like lasso and bronco came into English. She notes that "at present the sociocultural conditions are not favorable to linguistic borrowing from Spanish to English because Spanish now has 'immigrant' status comparable to that of foreign languages in other immigrant communities in the United States" (Sawyer, 1959, p. 281).

Measurement of language dominance or proficiency in the schools has, until recently, concerned itself primarily with foreign language testing of native English-speaking high-school and college students and teachers. In Trends in Language Teaching, Pimsleur (1966) describes the Modern Language

Association Cooperative Foreign Language Tests and his own experimental battery of proficiency tests for French and Spanish. In the last several years, however, there has developed a new testing concern: testing oral proficiency of preschool and primary-school bilingual children in their native language and in their second language. Such tests are intended to help determine the relative proficiency of the child in his two languages.[17] They may also serve the purpose of measuring the second language skills of native English speakers taking part in bilingual programs.

There is little contention with Lado's belief that speaking skills are of prime importance and need to be measured (Lado, 1961). However, there is considerable debate as to how to measure these skills. Lado (1961) advocates a discrete-point approach to measuring proficiency, in which the test elicits specific items that can be marked as correct or incorrect. In support of Lado, Mackey (1967) asserts that a student may avoid sentence structure and vocabulary of which he is unsure when given a spontaneous language test. However, Spolsky (1969) and Upshur (1969) reject discrete-point proficiency tests because they feel that these tests do not give an overall assessment of proficiency, namely, how well the child communicates.[18] Perren (1967) points out that testing for specific language elements requires that the test maker isolate and objectively score what are considered to be representative, important elements of speech. Such tests also require the establishment of relative weights for these elements in a total score. He concludes:

> . . . at present, there seems to be considerable justification for deliberately using tests of gross skills of communication rather than concentrating exclusively on tests of their assumed constituent elements (Perren, 1967, p. 28).

Davies (1968) and Wilkinson (1968) warn of the problems of reliability and validity for whatever tests are devised, and Fishman et al. (1967) give particular emphasis to the testing of minority groups.

Lado (1961) suggests that the choice of test items for a discrete-point testing instrument should rely on a contrastive analysis of the native and the foreign language. Contrastive analysis is the study of the differences and similarities in the structures of two languages. In reference to teaching materials, Fries wrote:

> The most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner (Fries, 1945, p. 9).

Lado has written a discussion of the principles and practices of such analysis[19] (Lado, 1957). Banathy, Trager, and Waddle (1966) suggest different ways that target elements in a contrastive analysis should be treated. The Center for Applied Linguistics has undertaken the development of contrastive analyses of English with each of five other languages: French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. Only the French and Russian studies have yet to be published (see Stockwell et al., 1965).

As noted in the discussion of coordinate and compound bilingualism, Weinreich and others have generally attributed the errors that non-native

speakers make in a language to interference from the native language. Contrastive analyses have been used to help determine the source of interference. Recently, research on Spanish-English bilingualism in Texas (Lance et al., 1969) and ESL classes for speakers of diverse languages in Quebec (Richards, 1970) suggest, however, that deviant language forms produced by non-native speakers of a target language are not necessarily a result of interference from the native language. Instead, these forms may either be common "errors" in the native speaker's development of his language (e.g., they loosed the game) or perfectly acceptable forms in non-standard English (e.g., he couldn't find no worms).

The advocates of tests of general communicative ability feel that tests based on contrastive analyses put too much emphasis on the points of supposed difficulty due to interference from the native language. As Perren puts it:

> . . .even where tests are designed for students having a single mother tongue, starting from a contrastive analysis seems potentially misleading and may easily lead to a concentration on 'testing for error' rather than on 'testing for success' (Perren, 1967, p. 28).

However, many advocates of the discrete-point approach would agree to some extent with Perren, and caution against over-reliance on contrastive analysis. Working with Spanish, English, Arabic, French, and Vietnamese, Briere (1967, 1968) has found that contrastive analysis is not necessarily a good predictor of error at the phonological level. Drawing on notions from transformational grammar, Ritchie (1967) stresses the interrelatedness of rules

within the grammar of a language and the consequent problems of comparing a structure from one language with one from another, such as is attempted in the contrastive analysis of grammatical structures (see Stockwell et al., 1965).

If young children learn a second language differently from adolescents and adults (Stern, 1967) and if contrastive analyses are based primarily on mistakes that adolescents and adults make when learning a second language, there is reason to believe that these contrastive analyses may be particularly inappropriate for predicting the second-language difficulties of young children. It would be interesting to do a contrastive analysis for children and see if materials based on this analysis would be more effective than those based on adult interference problems. At present there is very little literature concerning young children's acquisition of a second language. In fact, there are only a limited number of studies of native-language acquisition.

The literature on oral proficiency tests shows that little has been done to measure the Spanish-English language skills of bilingual primary school children. Most of the instruments have been measures of general communicative ability or fluency, rather than discrete-point tests. Sister Carrow (1957) reports that she had children retell a story that they had just heard, rather than have them make one up, as a measure of fluency. Lambert and Macnamara (1969) have used, and are still using, the same technique in Montreal. John T. Dailey (1968) devised a Language Facility Test in 1965, which uses photos, paintings, and drawings to elicit speech. Mycue (1968) used this test to find that pre-testing in Spanish and using Mexican American testers increased the

oral English proficiency scores of Mexican American children.[20]

Stemmler (1967) designed a test of spontaneous language and methods of thinking, called the Language Cognition Test. Spontaneous language is elicited by giving the child objects to describe, such as a cap, a ball, and a pen, and by asking them to tell a story about a picture. Ott and Jameson (1967) devised the Self Test, which includes prerecorded questions designed to elicit three levels of speech: literal, inferential, and imaginative. Peterson, Chuck, and Coladarci (1969) used cartoon strips to elicit speech from primary students. Taylor (1969) used a tape cassette-film strip device developed by Language Arts, Inc., of Austin, to elicit stories. Children are told to pretend that they are radio announcers and are to describe the film-strip frames as they see them.

There appears to be only one discrete-point test for measuring the Spanish and Egnlish oral proficiency of bilinguals. Cervenka (1967) developed a battery to test Spanish and English speaking and listening. He uses nine subtests measuring phonological, syntactic, and semantic control of both languages.[21] The Michigan Oral Language Productive Tests (1970) include a discrete-point test of oral English for native Spanish speakers. It seeks information on the following: the uses of be, do, have; the past tense and past participle; subject-verb agreement; the double negative; comparisons; possessives; plurals; and pronunciation. At least one other test of oral English has been devised (Moreno, 1970a; Moreno, 1970b). It is based on the Project H200 (1967) materials, and is intended to be used along with them.

At this very moment other tests are being devised, and still other tests exist and are being used, but have not been published or even discussed in the literature.

Many of the above-mentioned instruments would appear to effectively elicit speech samples of at least one kind: classroom speech. It is true, as Labov (1970a) points out, that children may be much more fluent when speaking among their peers in a more agreeable place than the classroom. Yet educators have been primarily concerned with children's speech behavior in school, and the above instruments appear to measure this type of speech.[22] However, there are problems of reliability associated with the recording and scoring of speech samples. Scoring techniques still require considerable refinement. There is little consensus across instruments, for example, as to what kind of scoring should be used. Taylor (1969) used a simple word count to determine fluency. Five frames of a filmstrip were shown and thirty seconds were allowed for discussion of each frame. Carrow (1957) analyzed three-minute samples of speech in terms of length and subordination of clauses, number and types of grammatical errors, number of words and number of different words. Dailey (1968) uses a 0-9 rating scale for each of three pictures. This scale combines ability to use language descriptively with ability to make inferences from pictures. In this instance, the scoring involves more than just an appraisal of language development. It includes an assessment of cognitive development. Stemmler's Language Cognition Test (1967) and the Michigan Oral Language Productive Tests (1970) include separate tests for measuring cognitive development.

Results from testing with the Cervenka bilingual instrument show that it is difficult to elicit specific item responses from six-and-seven year-old children (e.g., sentence completion, asking of questions, etc.). Furthermore, Cervenka (1967, p. 48) reports that young children lack the necessary language consciousness to judge whether a structure is "correct" or "incorrect -- a task that is called for in one of his subtests on grammar (e.g., "correct or "incorrect": "They singed very well yesterday." "A fly is more small than a mouse." "A tree is taller than I." "Where live birds?"). However, the children may not be lacking language consciousness, but rather an understanding of how to perform the required task. Other difficulties associated with using such discrete-point tests have been enumerated by Perren (1967).

It would appear that both discrete-point tests and tests of general communicative ability are useful in assessing the bilingual skills of young children. The value of the test of communicative skills is that is provides a measure of fluency in each of two languages, independent of specific vocabulary, pronunciation, or grammar. The value of the discrete-point test is its ability to give the teacher an idea of the students' specific language needs. The overall-skills test helps determine which language needs more development and in what general areas. The discrete-point test may suggest what items to teach. Currently, educational psychologists are stressing the importance of diagnostic testing for determining the specific skills that each child already possesses and those that he is lacking with respect to a given learning task (Gagne, 1970). The discrete-point approach to language testing is theore-

tically more in keeping with the above concern. The need is to develop truly diagnostic oral language tests for young children.[23]

Testing of oral language proficiency in Redwood City has so far been limited to the use of a test of overall fluency (Dailey, 1968) and an English sound test (Olguin, 1968). The following general information has been obtained concerning the Spanish-English bilingualism of the Redwood City kindergarteners and first graders. The Mexican American children are producing deviant grammatical forms in both English and Spanish that are not a result of interference from their first or second language (since interference may be two-way), but rather a normal part of intralingual development. Examples of intralingual development in English such as I throwed the ball were observed. In Spanish, several of the children have said yo sabo instead of yo sé. Cases of perfectly acceptable non-standard forms in English and Spanish have also been heard, such as he brang'em home and no hay nadien.

However, there are frequent cases of grammatical interference as well. Examples of Spanish grammar interfering with production of English include the following:

My house is more far. (Spanish: más allá)
Why you put that flower over there? (Spanish: Por qué pones. . .)

Instances of English grammatical forms interfering with Spanish forms have not yet been noted, but several parents have commented that their children "think in English" when they speak Spanish. Barker reports examples such

as está fuera de orden (it's out of order) from his study of Arizona Spanish (Barker, 1950, p. 6).

The most obvious case of interference is in the phonological realm. One or two Mexican Americans when speaking Spanish have trouble with the voiced bilabial fricative b, which they pronounce like the English labiodental fricative v, probably as a result of interference from the English sound. There are a number of areas of interference from Spanish in the pronunciation of English sounds. Among the most frequently mispronounced English consonants that can be traced to interference from Spanish are the intervocalic voiced stops b and d, as in baby and lady; syllable-initial, intervocalic, and utterance-final voiced sibilant z, as in zipper, roses, and bees respectively; and utterance-initial or intervocalic voiced th, as in this, and father. In these instances, problems in pronunciation can be traced to the absence of similar sounds in similar environments in Spanish. Taking the voiced z, for example, the sound does exist in Spanish, but only before a voiced consonant, as in desde. There are many other areas of consonantal interference, not to mention the many signs of interference in the vowel system.

The Olguin Diagnostic Sound Test (Olguin, 1968) was used to determine pronunciation of English sounds by the Mexican American first graders. In many ways the test serves as an excellent diagnostic tool for the classroom. However, more consideration should be given to acquisition of sounds by native speakers in the construction of a testing instrument. The Olguin test includes items like the final d in world, which native English-speaking children, and

even adults, may not pronounce. As in the case of grammar, Mexican American children may make intralingual errors in pronunciation of English sounds -- i.e., errors that will disappear in the course of language acquisition.

At the intonational level, there are some interesting observations to be noted. For instance, one child has intonational interference from Spanish in his English speech. Whereas he pronounces the English sounds almost perfectly, he uses Spanish intonational patterns. For example, he uses the affirmative pattern of rising intonation for all but the final phonic group (e.g., ↗↗↘): I went to the store ↗ to buy some candy ↗ and then I went home ↘. (The system for marking Spanish intonation is that of Navarro, 1967.) The normal intonation in English might be that of maintaining the same pitch at the word store, dropping it slightly at candy, and dropping it more abruptly at the end.

Two kinds of lexical borrowing have been noted among the first-grade Spanish speakers. In one case the word is brought intact from the other language: voy a poner en el desk, where are the llaves? In the other case, the borrowed word is modified to conform to the phonological rules of the language: me gustan los sellos (sellos instead of focas, for 'seals'), you can drop me off at the fabric (where fábrica is 'factory' in Spanish). As noted earlier, Haugen has termed the first group of words loanshifts and the second group loanwords (Haugen, 1950).

One case was observed where a first grader borrowed the English for an object when talking about it in Spanish and then used the Spanish word when talking about that same object in English a few moments later:

Aquí se pone el key.
Where are the llaves?

This is clearly a case of two-way loanshift.

It seems that at the first-grade level many Mexican Americans are not sure which code they are using -- not just the label for the language, but the actual components of speech. The above lexical loanshifts may be a reflection of this confusion. As pointed out above, this lack of code consciousness was also found to be prevalent among the six-and-seven-year-old Texan children that Cervenka tested (see Cervenka, 1967).

Although the language observations on Mexican Americans presented his paper are largely impressionistic, it should be evident even from these limited data that there are valuable linguistic insights to be gained from further study of these North Californian bilinguals. Such linguistic insights might help to improve the effort to educate Mexican American children in the classroom.

Chapter III

Summary and Conclusion

The Mexican American community in Redwood City has grown considerably in the last five years. Between 1964 and 1969, the proportion of Spanish-surnamed students (K-8) enrolled in the school more than doubled. ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education programs were initiated during the 1969-1970 school year, and Redwood City was selected as one of California's twenty-three cities for bilingual schooling through Title VII. The Redwood City project began with one first-grade class of twenty Spanish speakers and ten English speakers, both groups studying two languages and two cultures.

The bilingual education projects provide an opportunity for research on the language acquisition of lower-class Mexican American children. It is clear that more needs to be known about how these bilingual children develop competence in their two languages. Studies indicate that home factors may be important in the verbal development of children, and that a positive self-concept may be instrumental to school success. Thus, a thorough study of the effects of a bilingual education program in a community should investigate home factors and the attitudes that the children and the parents have about themselves, about others, and about the program.

Demographic data on California was presented, with particular reference to Mexican settlement in Redwood City and to the patterns of employment

for this group. The sociolinguistic consequences of the rapid influx of Spanish speakers to Redwood City was considered. Speculation was made concerning the future of the Spanish language in California. Sociolinguistic research techniques which help determine the frequency of use of Spanish and English were presented, as were attitudinal techniques for determining how bilinguals feel about the two languages that they speak.

One of the few sociolinguistic studies of a Mexican American community was described and used as the basis for discussion of the Redwood City bilingual community. Redwood City has roughly two groups of bilinguals, with dialectal diversity within each group. The first group are the recent-immigrant adults who speak standard and/or non-standard Spanish, and may speak a little English. The second group are the children of the immigrants, who speak the Spanish dialects of their parents and various local California dialects of Spanish, as well as standard and non-standard English.

Ways of classifying bilinguals were discussed, as were the difficulties incurred when attempting to make such classifications. Language dominance was used to refer to a bilingual's language proficiency. The dominant language was defined as the language in which the bilingual speaker is more proficient for a given media, speech role, speech situation, and domain. A balanced bilingual is a speaker for whom neither language is dominant under specified conditions. The phenomena of mixing languages and of borrowing vocabulary were mentioned, and the sociolinguistic relevance of such behavior was suggested. The direction of borrowing may give clues as to the relative social

value of the two languages in the speech community.

Whereas testing of language proficiency has taken place at secondary and college levels for English-speakers studying foreign languages, a new concern to test the oral proficiency of bilingual preschool and primary-school children has emerged. Along with this concern has arisen a debate over whether discrete-point tests or tests of overall communicative ability should be used. Discrete-point tests were seen to derive many of their items from contrastive analysis. But recent studies suggest that many 'errors' that non-native speakers of English make are intralingual, i.e., common difficulties for all learners of English.

The literature on discrete-point and overall-skill tests of oral proficiency for young bilinguals was reviewed, and problems of reliability of instruments were considered. General information on the nature of Spanish-English bilingualism among the Redwood City kindergarteners and first-graders was presented. Examples of Spanish and English intralingual 'errors' in grammar, grammatical interference, phonological interference, intonational interference, and lexical borrowing were discussed.

* * *

Several conclusions that may be drawn from this paper are as follows:

(1) The advent of bilingual schooling in America provides a new focus for study of the Mexican American bilingual child and inquiry into his acquisition of two languages.

(2) Socio-economic and other home factors should be considered in studying the child's verbal abilities in order to better understand why certain lower-class bilinguals excel verbally and others lack verbal skills.

(3) Research needs to be carried out in greater depth and breadth to determine the bilingual dominance configuration for Redwood City and the attitudinal environment in this community in respect to language and culture. Such information could help in describing the maintenance and shift of the Spanish language in Redwood City, and, by extension, in California.

(4) Better discrete-point and overall-skill tests are necessary both for improving pedagogical techniques and for furthering language acquisition theory. Such tests would add considerably to the impressionistic language data presented in this paper.

Appendix:

Questionnaires

Questionnaire #1: Home Interview for Parents of Redwood City School Children

hh#_____

Address_____ Phone_____

No.s of Household Members	1	2	. . .	15	
Name					
Relationship to Head					
Sex					
Age					
Birthplace					
Occupation					
Highest Grade Completed					

	Children in Household				
	1	2	. . .	10	
1. Has _____ had pre-school? (3= Sp; 2= Sp & Eng; 1= Eng, 0= none)					
2. Where was (is) it located?					
3. Has _____ been to kindergarten? (3= Sp; 2= Sp & Eng; 1= Eng; 0= none)					
4. Where was (is) it located?					
5. For how many years did _____ go to kindergarten?					
6. Before _____ started kindergarten, could he: a. recite the alphabet? b. recognize letters? c. read? d. count? e. print his name? f. name colors? (3= Sp; 2= Sp & Eng; 1= Eng; 0= no)					
7. In what language do (did) you read to _____? (3= Sp; 2= Sp & Eng; 1= Eng; 0= no)					
8. How often do (did) you usually read to _____?					
9. How often do (did) you help _____ with his homework?					
10. Have you met _____'s current teacher?					

11. How long have you lived in Redwood City?

12. Where did you live before moving to Redwood City?

13. Do you go to Mexico for visits? If yes, how often?

14. Would you like to go there eventually to live?

15. Has mother or anyone else in the family had any teaching experience?

16. Do you have dictionaries in your home? English__ Spanish__ Other_____

17. What magazines or newspapers do you have at home?

18. Are there any crayons, paints, paper, scissors, or paste at home?

19. About how many hours a day do your children watch TV programs?
    Do they watch any programs in Spanish?
    Does anyone in the home listen to Spanish radio programs?

20. Do your children ever ask you what certain words mean?
    Spanish words? English words?
    Do you try to explain?

21. Where do you think the best Spanish is spoken?
    Who do you think speaks the best Spanish around here?
    Do you ever try to get your children to speak that way?

22. Where do you think the best English is spoken?
    Who do you think speaks the best English around here?
    Do you ever try to get your children to speak that way?

23. If your children are sick and can't go to school, are any of them disappointed?
    If yes, which ones?

24. Do you go to school for things other than teachers' conferences?

Language Proficiency

	Household Members			
Spanish (2= yes; 1= a little; 0= no)	1	2	. . .	15
1. Can _____ understand a conversation in Spanish?				
2. Can _____ engage in an ordinary conversation in Spanish?				
3. Can _____ read a newspaper in Spanish?				
4. Can _____ write letters in Spanish?				
English (2= yes; 1= a little; 0= no)				
5. Can _____ understand a conversation in English?				
6. Can _____ engage in an ordinary conversation in English?				
7. Can _____ read a newspaper in English?				
8. Can _____ write letters in English?				

Other (2= yes; 1= a little; 0= no)

9-12 as above, if applicable.

Language Use

(3= Sp; 2= both; 1= Eng; 0= no)	Household Members 1	2	. . .	15
13. What language does _____ use most frequently at home for conversation with adults?				
14. What language does _____ use most frequently at home for conversation with children?				
15. What language does _____ use most frequently to read books or newspapers at home?				
16. What language does _____ commonly use at home for writing letters?				
17. What language does _____ use most at work for conversations with fellow workers?				
18. What language does _____ use most at work for conversations with the supervisor (boss)?				
19. What language does _____ commonly use when talking to people of the same age in the neighborhood (on the street)?				
20. What was (is) the language of instruction in _____'s school? (2= Sp; 1= Eng & Sp; 0= Eng)				
21. What language does _____ like most for conversation with adults?				

Language Use (cont.)

(3= Sp; 2= both; 1= Eng; 0= no)

	Household Members			
	1	2	. . .	15
22. What language does _____ like most for conversation with children?				
23. In what language does _____'s priest (minister) give the _____ when _____ attends services?				
24. In what language is the service conducted when you attend church?				

Notes: (1) Use NR for "no response".
Use NP for "not applicable" (for example, the work questions for individuals that do not work, such as housewives, school children).

(2) When individuals are currently unemployed, currently not going to church, currently not writing letters, etc., reword question to: when you were working, when you did go to church, when you used to write letters, etc.

Questionnaire #2: Pupil's Language Use and Proficiency Inventory

(2= Sp; 1= both; 0= Eng)

1. In what language does your mother usually talk to you at home?
   What language do you use to talk to her?

2. What language does your father use to talk to you at home?
   What language do you use to talk to him?

3. What language do your parents speak when they talk to each other at home?

4. What language do your older brothers and sisters use when they talk to you at home?
   What language do you use when you talk to them?

5. What language do your younger brothers and sisters use when they talk to you at home?
   What language do you use to talk to them?

6. Who are the kids you hang out with in school?
   When you are with_____in the school playground, what language do you usually speak?

7. What kids do you hang out with where you live?
   When you're with_____what language do you use?

8. Who do you go to church with?
   When you're standing outside the church along with_____, what language do you speak?

Word Naming

Tell me as many English (Spanish) words as you can that name things you can see or find in a kitchen -- your kitchen or any other kitchen. Words like salt (sal), spoon (cuchara), rice (arroz). (Time limit of 45 seconds.)

(The three other places besides your kitchen are: in school, inside your church, on the street by your house.)

Questionnaire #3: Mexican American Parents' Language Attitudes

Is this a good reason for my children to learn Spanish?	very good reason	good reason	neither good nor bad reason	bad reason	very bad reason
1. It will help them to preserve their own native language and culture.					
2. It will someday be useful to them in getting a good job.					
3. It will enable them to maintain friendships among Mexican Americans.					
4. It will enable them to continue to think and behave as true Mexican Americans (Chicanos)					
5. No one is really educated unless he is fluent in the Spanish language.					
6. It will allow them to meet and converse with more and varied people.					
7. They need it for some specific educational or business goals					

Is this a good reason for my children to learn English?	very good reason	good reason	neither good nor bad reason	bad reason	very bad reason
1. It enables them to make friendships among Anglos (Gavachos).					
2. It will someday be useful to them in getting a job.					
3. They need a good knowledge of English to be respected by the Anglo community.					
4. It will enable them to think and behave as Anglos do.					
5. No one is really educated unless he is fluent in English.					
6. It will allow them to meet and converse with more and varied people.					
7. They need it for some specific educational or business goals.					

Questionnaire #4: Anglo Parents' Language Attitudes

Is this a good reason for my children to learn Spanish?	very good reason	good reason	neither good nor bad reason	bad reason	very bad reason
1. It will help them better understand the Mexican American people and their way of life.					
2. It will someday be useful to them in getting a good job.					
3. It will enable them to gain good friends more easily among Spanish-speaking people.					
4. One needs a good knowledge of at least one foreign language to merit social recognition.					
5. It will enable them to begin to think and behave as Mexican Americans do.					
6. No one is really educated unless he is fluent in the Spanish language.					
7. It will allow them to meet and converse with more and varied people.					
8. They need it for some specific educational or business goal.					

Questionnaire #5: Attitudes of Parents and Children toward Their Own and the Other Group

Parents' Ratings of Mexican Americans and Anglos

honest	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	dishonest
irreligious	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	religious
hot tempered	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	even tempered
good looking	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	ugly
unfriendly	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	friendly
possesses self-confidence	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	lacks self-confidence
affectionate	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	not affectionate
lazy	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	industrious
dependable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	not dependable
weak	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	strong
intelligent	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	stupid
dirty	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	clean

Pupils' Ratings of Mexican Americans and Anglos

nice	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	not nice
handsome	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	ugly
happy	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	sad
lazy	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	works hard
friend	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	enemy
weak	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	strong
smart	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	dumb
dirty	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____	clean

Footnotes

1. The long-term (five-year) plan was for a "dual-medium differential-maintenance type" (Mackey, 1970), where fluency and literacy are taught in both languages, but literacy in mother tongue is restricted to certain subject matter, most generally that related to the ethnic group and its cultural heritage. Fishman (1970) calls this a "partial bilingualism" model. For the short term (one-two years), however, the Redwood City program taught the Spanish speakers all the subject matter in the mother tongue.

2. The term Anglo is used to denote native speakers rather than people of Anglo-Saxon origin. The term Mexican American refers to Americans of Mexican descent, whether native Spanish speakers or not.

3. Mexican American teachers, and, by extension, testers may be harsher on Mexican American children than are Anglos. According to Carter (1970, pp. 118-120), they are over-anxious to prove that the Mexican American children can perform well.

4. It is also true that many tests are culturally biased against them. However, it is difficult, if not impossible, to eliminate such bias. Instead, it is the responsibility of those who interpret the tests results to do so sensibly.

5. See Hernández (1970) for an emphasis on the factors accompanying low social class for a minority group person: poverty, low status family occupation, prejudice, segregation, hostile personal contacts, poor quality school facilities and biased teachers. Also see Parsons (1965) on biased teachers.

6. Mackey (1970): "One of the pawns in the politics of local minorities has been the question of bilingual schooling. This is a question which often arouses bitter conflicts which are rarely resolved by the sort of objective analysis and impartial studies needed. The situation is aggravated by the lack of knowledge on the advantages, and disadvantages of bilingual education and on the conditions under which it is useful or harmful." (p. 596).

7. Conversation with C. J. Bustamante, co-author of Bustamante & Bustamante, 1969.

8. Mackey (1970): "The learner brings to the school a pattern of language behavior and a configuration of language dominance. . . There is a wide range of possible variations in the competence of the learner in each of

his languages. . .the child's proficiency may be limited in some domains and extensive in others, depending on his pattern of language behavior outside of school. . ." (p. 605).

9. A brief study by Gumperz and Hernández (1969) adds "direct quoting" and "facility of recall" as two more variables that may help explain choice of language. They examine code switching when topic, speakers, and setting are held constant. Chicanos speaking English to one another are seen to switch to Spanish when quoting what someone said in Spanish or for greater ease in recalling a speech act that took place in Spanish.

10. Diebold (1968) discusses the individual's identity crisis brought on in a bicultural community by a social dominant monolingual society where the bicultural community is stigmatized as socially inferior and where becoming bilingual is an assimilative responsibility. He says, however, "In some cases, cross-generational (parent-child) conflict is as destructive as that exerted by the conventionalized conflict between the monolingual and bilingual communities" (p. 239).

11. Labov emphasizes the importance of the peer group while the child is between four and thirteen, if the parents' speech is different from that of the peer group. Labov states that if a difference exists, ". . .(the child's) English will resemble that of his peers rather than that of his parents. . ." (Labov, 1970b, pp. 33-34).

12. See Griffith (1947) for a description of the Pachuco spoken in Los Angeles.

13. Saville and Troike (1970) also qualify the use of the terms "coordinate" and "compound": "The two types of bilingualism. . .are extremes . . .few bilinguals would be purely one or the other type" (p. 13).

Robert L. Cooper (personal conversation) questions the utility of the two terms because of the lack of behavioral correlates for them. G. Richard Tucker (personal conversation) feels that the distinction between compound and coordinate bilingualism will become increasingly unimportant and that degree of bilingual balance will be the main concern.

14. Language dominance has a more precise use than that presented in this paper (p. 21). Lambert, Macnamara and others (see Macnamara, 1967) have used language dominance to refer to a situation in which there is no functional allocation of languages and yet one language is chosen more frequently than another.

15. Mackey feels that part of bilingual education involves the measurement of the extent of childrens' mixing of languages and by domain: "If the child comes from a home where two or more languages are used, he may find

it difficult to separate them. The extent and degree of language mixture may vary considerably from one bilingual child to the next, and from one domain to another. Tests will be needed to show how well a bilingual child keeps his languages apart" (p. 605).

16. Gumperz and Hernández (1969) suggest that Chicanos switch to Spanish with other Chicanos when they are quoting directly or reporting something that took place in Spanish.

17. Mackey states that it is important to study what happens to the language behavior of the child under the influence of bilingual schooling -- to help determine the relative proficiency of the child in his two languages as he starts the program and as he progresses (Mackey, 1970, p. 605).

18. Carroll refers to general communicative ability or proficiency as the use of integrated skills (see Carroll, 1961; R. Cooper, 1968).

19. More recently Harris stresses the importance of contrastive analysis: "When one is designing a test of English for subjects who all share the same first language, contrastive analysis is undoubtedly useful in helping to establish the probably relative difficulty of various patterns in the target language -- in this case, English" (Harris, 1969, p. 11).

20. However, Mycue has the Anglo and the Mexican American testers administer the instrument differently. Thus, the reporting of higher scores when the Mexican American tester is used may just be an artifact of test administration. This writer feels that the ethnicity of the tester may be irrelevant if he or she is sympathetic towards the student.

21. On a more informal level, Lily Wong Flood, Bilingual Education Consultant to the County of Santa Clara, has attempted to elicit specific verb forms in Spanish from pre-schoolers in a San Jose Title VII project. A doll house and dolls are used to tell a story which the child is to repeat. The examiner is listening for the correct palatalization of -ar verbs: sentar -- me siento, as opposed to me sentó (ie in the stem, as opposed to e).

22. That is not to say that educators should not be interested in children's speech behavior outside of class. Indeed, they should be. Perhaps, development of language skills in the classroom should depend more on the language base acquired outside of class. Of course this would mean the teaching, or at least awareness, of nonstandard dialects of both English and Spanish that are spoken out of class.

23. But the task is not an easy one. As Harris points out, "The technique of eliciting and rating highly structured speech samples shows much promise, but such testing is still in the experimental stage and requires very great test-writing skill and experience" (Harris, 1969, p. 90).

Bibliography

Anderson, James G. and William M. Johnson
1968 "Socio-cultural Determinants of Achievement Among Mexican-American Students." Las Cruces, New Mexico: New Mexico State University. ERIC ED 017 394, 45 pp.

Anisfeld, M. and W. E. Lambert
1961 "Social and psychological variables in learning Hebrew." J. of Abnorm. Soc. Psych. 63:524-529.

Banathy, Bela, E. C. Trager, and C. D. Waddle
1966 "The Use of Contrastive Data in Foreign Language Course Development." In A. Valdman (ed.), Trends in Language Teaching. McGraw-Hill, N. Y.

Barker, George C.
1947 "Social Functions of Language in a Mexican-American Community." Acta Americana 5:185-202.

Barker, George C.
1950 "Pachuco, An American-Spanish Argot and Its Social Functions in Tucson, Arizona." U. of Arizona, Tucson. Soc. Sci. Bul. 21.1, #18. 39 pp.

Bernal, Joe J.
1969 "I am Mexican-American." The Fla. FL Reporter 7.1:32, 154.

Bloom, Benjamin S.
1964 Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Briere, Eugene J.
1967 "Phonological Testing Reconsidered." Lg. Learning 17.3,4: 163-171.

Briere, Eugene J.
1968 Psycholinguistic Study of Phonological Interference. The Hague: Mouton and Co., Paris. 84 pp.

Bustamante, L., Charles J. and Patricia L. Bustamante
1969 The Mexican-American and the United States. Patty-Lar

Publications LTD. P. O. Box 4177, Mt. View, California 94040.

Carroll, John B.
1961 "Fundamental Considerations in Testing for English Language Proficiency of Foreign Students," Testing, Center for Applied Linguistics.

Carrow, Sister Mary Arthur
1957 "Linguistic Functioning of bilingual and monolingual children." J. of Speech and Hearing Disorders 22:371-80.

Carter, Thomas P.
1970 Mexican Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect. College Entrance Examination Board, New York.

Cervenka, Edward J.
1967 "Final report on Head Start evaluation and research: 1966-1967. Section VI: The measurement of bilingualism and bicultural socialization of the child in the school setting; the development of instruments." Austin, Texas: Child Development Evaluation and Research Center, U. of Texas. ERIC ED 019 122.

Christian, Jane M. and Chester C. Christian, Jr.
1966 "Spanish Language and Culture in the Southwest." In J. Fishman (ed.), Language Loyalty in the United States, The Hague: Mouton and Co., Paris. Pp. 280-317.

Cohen, Andrew D.
1969 "An explication of 'prestige language'." Unpublished paper, Stanford University, 17 pp.

Cooper, Robert L.
1968 "An elaborated language testing model." In Problems in Foreign Language Testing. Language Learning. Special Issue No. 3.

Cooper, Robert L.
1968 "Two Contextualized Measures of Degree of Bilingualism." In J. A. Fishman, Bilingualism in the barrio, Final Report. New York: Yeshiva U. Pp. 505-520.

Cordova, Ignacio R.
1969 "The Relationship of Acculturation, Achievement, and

Alienation among Spanish American Sixth Grade Students." Las Cruces, New Mexico: New Mex. State U. ERIC ED 025 359, pp. 24.

Dailey, John T.
1968 Language Facility Test, Test Administrator's Manual. The Allington Corporation, 801 N. Pitt Street #701, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

Davies, Alan
1968 "Introduction." In A. Davies (ed.), Language Testing Symposium. London: Oxford U. Press, pp. 1-18.

Derbyshire, Robert L.
1969 "Adaptation of Adolescent Mexican Americans to United States Society." Amer. Behavioral Scientist, pp. 88-103.

Diebold, A. Richard
1961a "Incipient Bilingualism." Language 37:97-112.

Diebold, A. Richard
1961b Bilingualism and Biculturalism in a Huave Community. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Yale U.

Diebold, A. Richard
1968 "The Consequences of Early Bilingualism in Cognitive Development and Personality Formation." In Edward Norbeck et al. (eds.), The Study of Personality: An Interdisciplinary Approach. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. Pp. 218-245.

Edelman, Martin
1968 "The Contextualization of Schoolchildren's Bilingualism." In J. A. Fishman, Bilingualism in the Barrio, Final Report. New York: Yeshiva U. Pp. 525-537.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M.
1964 "An Analysis of interaction of language, topic, and listener." Amer. Anthropologist 66.2:86-102.

Ervin, Susan M. and Charles E. Osgood
1954 "Second language learning and bilingualism." J. of Abnormal and Social Psychology 49:139-146.

Espinosa, Aurelio M.
Studies in New Mexico Spanish: I, Phonology (Chicago, 1909); II, Morphology (Hamburg, 1913); III, The English Elements (Halle, 1915). Collected by Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, California.

Espinosa, Aurelio M.
1917 "Speech Mixture in New Mexico: the Influence of the English Language on New Mexican Spanish." In H. M. Stephens and H. E. Bolton (eds.), The Pacific Ocean in History. MacMillan Co., N.Y. Pp. 408-428.

Firme, Thereza Penna
1969 Effects of social reinforcement on self-esteem of Mexican-American children. Ph. D. Dissertation. Stanford University, Stanford, Ca.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1964 "Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry." Linguistics 9:32-70.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1965 "Bilingualism, intelligence and language learning." Modern Language Journal 49:227-237.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1966a "The Implications of Bilingualism for Language Teaching and Language Learning." In A. Valdman (ed.), Trends in Language Teaching. McGraw-Hill, N.Y.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1966b Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton and Co.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1968 Bilingualism in the Barrio, Final Report. New York: Yeshiva U. ERIC ED 026 546.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1969 "Some Things Learned: Some Things Yet to Learn." The Modern Language Journal 53:255-258.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1970 "Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective." Paper delivered at TESOL Conference, March 20-29, 1970, San Francisco Prepared in collaboration with John Lovas.

Fishman, J. A., M. Deutsch, L. Kogan, R. North, M. Whiteman.
1967 "Guidelines for testing minority group children." In A. H. Passow et al.(eds.), Education of the Disadvantaged. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Pp. 155-169.

Fogel, Walter
1965 "Education and Income of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest." Mexican-American Study Project Advance Report 1. Los Angeles, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business, UCLA, 28 pp.

Fries, Charles C.
1945 Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language. Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan Press.

Gaarder, A. Bruce
1967 "Organization of the Bilingual School." J. of Social Issues 23.2:110-120.

Gagne, Robert M.
1970 "Some New Views of Learning and Instruction." Phi Delta Kappan 50.9:468-472.

Gardner, R. C.
1960 Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. Unpub. Ph. D. Thesis, McGill University.

Gardner, Robert C. and W. E. Lambert
1959 "Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition." Canadian Journal of Psychology 13:266-272.

Griffith, Beatrice
1947 "The Pachuco patois." Common Ground 7:77-84.

Gumperz, John J. and Edward Hernández
1969 "Cognitive Aspects of Bilingual Communication." Working Paper #28. Language-Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley.

Harris, David P.
1969 Testing English as a Second Language. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Haugen, Einar I.
1950 "The analysis of linguistic borrowing." Language 26:210-231.

Haugen, Einar I.
1953 The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior. 2 Vols. U. of Penn. Press.

Haugen, Einar I.
1956 Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide. University of Alabama, The American Dialect Society.

Henríquez Ureña, Pedro
1935 El español en Méjico, los Estados Unidos y la América Central. Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana, IV, Instituto de filología, Universidad Nacional, Buenos Aires. Pp. xvii-xx.

Hernández, Deluvina
1970 "Mexican American Challenge to a Sacred Cow." Mexican American Cultural Center, Monograph No. 1. U. of California, Los Angeles.

Hills, E. C.
1938 "El español de Nuevo Méjico." In P. Henríquez Ureña (ed.), El español en Méjico, los Estados Unidos y la América Central. Bibl. de Dial. Hisp., IV, Buenos Aires. Pp. 1-73.

Hoffman, Moses N. H.
1934 The Measurement of Bilingual Background. Columbia U. Press, N.Y.

Hymes, Dell
1962 "The ethnography of speaking." In T. Gladwin and W. Sturtevant (eds.), Anthropology and human behavior. Anthro. Soc. of Washington, Wash. D.C., pp. 15-53.

Hymes, Dell
1967 "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting." J. of Soc. Issues, 23.2:8-28.

Jones, W. R.
1960 "A critical study of bilingualism and nonverbal intelligence." British Journal of Educational Psych. 30:71-76.

Kercheville, F. M.
1934 "A Preliminary Glossary of New Mexico Spanish." U. of New Mexico Bulletin, Language Series, Vol. 5, #3.

Kolers, Paul A.
1968 "Bilingualism and Information Processing." Scientific American 218.3:78-84.

Labov, William
1969 "The Logic of non-standard English." The Florida FL Reporter 7.1:60-74, 169.

Labov, William
1970a "The Educational Campaign Against Negro Children." Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, San Francisco, Ca.

Labov, William
1970b The Study of Nonstandard English. National Council of Teachers of English, by Special Arrangement with the Center for Applied Linguistics.

Lado, Robert
1957 Linguistics across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers. Ann Arbor, U. of Michigan Press.

Lado, Robert
1961 Language Testing. London: Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd.

Lambert, Wallace E.
1955 "Measurement of linguistic dominance of bilinguals." J. of Abnormal and Social Psychology 50:197-200.

Lambert, Wallace E.
1967 "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism." J. of Soc. Issues 23.2:91-109.

Lambert, Wallace E.
1969 "Psychological Aspects of Motivation in Language Learning." The Fla. FL Reporter 7.1:95-97, 169.

Lambert, W. E., R. C. Gardner, R. Olton, and K. Tunstall
1962 "A study of the roles of attitudes and motivation in second-language learning." McGill University (mimeo).

Lambert, W. E., H. Frankel, and G. R. Tucker
1966 "Judging Personality Through Speech: A French-Canadian Example." The J. of Communication 16.4:305-321.

Lambert, W. E. and J. Macnamara
1969 "Some cognitive consequences of following a first-grade

curriculum in a second language." J. Ed. Psych. 60.2: 86-96.

Lambert, W. E., G. R. Tucker, A. d'Anglejan, and S. Segalowitz
1970 "Cognitive and Attitudinal Consequences of Following the Curricula of the First Three Grades in a Foreign Language." Mimeo, McGill U. 99 pp.

Lance, Donald M. et al.
1969 A Brief Study of Spanish-English Bilingualism: Final Report. Research Project ORR-Liberal Arts-15504. Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas.

Lewis, Hilda P. and Edward R. Lewis
1965 "Written language performance of sixth grade children of low SES from bilingual and from monolingual backgrounds." J. of Exper. Ed. 33.3:237-242.

Lieberson, Stanley
1966 "Language Questions in Censuses." Sociol. Inquiry 36.2: 262-279.

Mackey, William F.
1967 Language Teaching Analysis, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 403-418.

Mackey, William F.
1970 "A typology of Bilingual Education." For. Language Annals 3.4:596-608.

Macnamara, John
1967 "The Bilingual's Linguistic Performance--A Psychological Overview." J. of Soc. Issues 23.2:58-77.

Michigan Oral Language Series
1970 Michigan Oral Language Productive Tests, ACTFL Edition, Curriculum Division, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan 48902.

Milner, Ester
1951 "A Study of the Relationship Between Reading Readiness in Grade One School Children and Patterns of Parent-Child Interaction." Child Development 22:95-112.

Moreno, Albert
1969 Summary of E. S. L. Survey Sheet. Submitted to the

Superintendant and Principals, Redwood City School District, Redwood City, Ca. (mimeo).

Moreno, Steve
1970a Oral English Proficiency Placement Test. Moreno Educational Co., 3226 Galloway Dr., San Diego, Calif. 92122.

Moreno, Steve
1970b "Testing (Placement, Diagnostic and Achievement) for English as a Second Language." Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, San Francisco, Ca.

Mycue, Elena Ines de Los Santos
1968 Testing in Spanish and the Subsequent Measurement of English Fluency. Master's Thesis, Texas Woman's University, College of Education 44 pp ERIC ED 026 193.

Navarro, Tomas
1967 Manual de Pronunciación Española. 6a. ed. Hafner Publishing Co., New York & London.

Nisbet, John
1961 "Family Environment and Intelligence." In A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson (eds.), Education, Economy, and Society. Free Press of Glencoe, N. Y. Pp. 273-287.

Olguin, Leonard
1968 Diagnostic Sound Test, Developed for Use with "Shuck Loves Chirley", Erhardt & Associates, Beach Plaza, 17171 Beach Blvd., Huntington Beach, Ca. 92647.

Ott, Elizabeth H.
1967 A Study of Levels of Fluency and Proficiency in Oral English of Spanish-Speaking School Beginners. Unpub. Ph. D., College of Education, The University of Texas, as Austin. Austin, Texas.

Parsons, Theodore W., Jr.
1965 Ethnic Cleavage in a California School. Ph. D. Dissertation, Stanford University.

Perren, George
1967 "Testing ability in English as a second language: 3. Spoken language." English Language Teaching 12.1:22-29.

Petersen, Robert O. H., H. C. Chuck, A. P. Coladarci, et al.
1969 Teaching Standard English as a Second Dialect to Primary School Children in Hilo, Hawaii. Final Report to Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Hawaii District, State of Hawaii Department of Education, P. O. Box 1922, Hilo, Hawaii 96720.

Pimsleur, Paul
1966 "Testing Foreign Language Learning." In A. Valdman (ed.), Trends in Language Teaching. McGraw-Hill Book Co., pp. 175-215.

Post, Anita C.
1933 "Some Aspects of Arizona Spanish." Hispania 16:35-42.

Post, Anita C.
1943 "Southern Arizona Spanish Phonology." U. of New Mexico Bulletin.

Project H200
1967 "Guide for Teaching English as a Second Language to Elementary School Pupils." Level 1. Directed by Robert Wilson and authored by Evelyn Bauer, Eddie Hanson, Jr., Donald Meyer, and Lois Michael. Los Angeles: U. of California (mimeo).

Richards, Jack
1970 "Intralingual Interference in Language Learning." Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, San Francisco, Ca. International Center for Research on Bilingualism, Laval University, Quebec, Canada.

Riley, John E.
1968 "The Influence of Bilingualism on Tested Verbal Ability in Spanish." Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas. ERIC ED o26 935.

Ritchie, W. C.
1967 "Some Implications of Generative Grammar for the Construction of Courses in English as a Foreign Language." Language Learning 17.182 (Part I) and 17.384 (Part II).

Rubin, Joan
1968a National Bilingualism in Paraguay. Mouton: The Hague.

Rubin, Joan
1968b "Language Education in Paraguay." In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, and J. Das Gupta (eds.), Language Problems of Developing Nations, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Rubin, Joan
1968c "Toward the use of formal methods in the detection of cultural change." Paper presented at the 8th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences.

Saville, Muriel R. and Rudolph C. Troike
1970 "A Handbook of Bilingual Education." Clearinghouse for Linguistics. ERIC.

Sawyer, Janet B.
1957 A Dialect Study of San Antonio, Texas: A Bilingual Community. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Texas. 331 pp.

Sawyer, Janet B.
1969 "Aloofness from Spanish influence in Texas English." Word 15: 270-280.

Spolsky, Bernard
1969 "Language Testing -- The Problem of Validation." The Fla. FL Reporter 7.1:100-102, 163-164.

Stemmler, Anne O.
1967 "The LCT, Language Cognition Test Research Edition -- A Test for Educationally Disadvantaged School Beginners." TESOL Quarterly 1:35-43.

Stern, H. H.
1967 Foreign Languages in primary education. Oxford University Press, 146 pp.

Stockwell, Robert P., J. D. Bowen, and J. W. Martin
1965 The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London.

Taylor, Thomasine H.
1969 A Comparative Study of the Effects of Oral-Aural Language Training on Gains in English Language for Fourth and Fifth Grade Disadvantaged Mexican-American Children. Ph. D. Thesis, The U. of Texas at Austin. Austin, Texas.

Tucker, G. Richard and W. E. Lambert
1969 "White and Negro Listeners' Reactions to Various American-English Dialects." Social Forces, pp. 463-468.

Upshur, John A.
1969 "Productive Communication Testing: Progress Report." Presented at the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics. Cambridge, U. K.

Valdez, R. F.
1969 "The Fallacy of the Spanish Surname Survey." J. of California Teachers Assoc. 65.3:29-32.

Valencia, Atilano A.
1969 Bilingual/Bicultural Education: A Perspective Model in Multicultural America. Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc. OEC-4-062827-3078.

Weinreich, Uriel
1951 Research Problems in Bilingualism with Special Reference to Switzerland. Unpub. doctoral dissertation. Department of Linguistics, Columbia University.

Wertman, Joyce M.
1969 A Study of a Bilingual Nursery School. Master's Thesis in Education, San Francisco State College. 77 pp.

Wilkinson, Andrew
1968 "The Testing of Oracy." In A. Davies (ed.), Language Testing Symposium. London: Oxford University Press, pp. 117-133.

Wilson, Herbert B.
1968 "Evaluation of the Influence of Educational Programs on Mexican-Americans." Prepared for the National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans. Austin, Texas.

Wood, Kenneth S.
1946 "Parental Maladjustments and Functional Articulatory Defects in Children." J. of Speech and Hearing Disorders 11:255-275.